

## REMARKS

### I. Status of the Claims

Claims 2, 6-11, 13 and 14 are pending. Claims 2, 6 and 11 are in independent form. Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of Claims 2 and 6-10. Claim 11 has been amended to address the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendment and in light of these remarks is respectfully requested.

### II. Amendment to the Specification

Paragraph [0007] has been amended to recite a carbon trifluoride substituent. It is clear from the figure preceding the text what is being referenced, and applicants respectfully request entry of the proposed correction as being directed to a formal matter.

### III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The sole remaining substantive issue is the rejection of claims 11, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner has objected to claim 11 "because n and m are not defined." The claims have been amended to delete the phrase "m-valent" and to recite that "n and m are integers equal to the valence of Core."

Claims 11 and 12 were originally dependent on claim 1. Responsive to the indication of allowable subject matter in the June 15, 2004 Office Action, claim 12 was rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of claims 1 and 11. In a telephone conference on September 28, 2004 the Examiner explained her objection to the phrase "m-valent." Although an Examiner's Amendment was discussed, the Examiner ultimately

issued an Office Action so that the applicant could address these issues. It is believed that the foregoing amendment addresses the Examiner's objection. Specifically, the phrase "m-valent" has been deleted and m and n are said to be equal to the valence of Core. No new matter is introduced by these amendments, as set forth below.

In original claim 1, "n" was defined as the number of iridium complexes bonded to group A, which is also the number of ligand groups on A bonding to the respective iridium atoms (see paragraph [0006]). Therefore, it is clearly correct to say that n is equal to the valence of A.

In claim 11, "A" corresponds to "Core-R<sub>n</sub>-L<sub>n</sub>" (see paragraph [0009]), and it is again clearly correct to say that n is equal to the valence of Core.

In original Claim 11, Core was said to be "m-valent," i.e., there are "m" iridium complexes shown in the formula and each one of them is bonded (through -R<sub>n</sub>-L<sub>n</sub>-) to a valence point on Core. Thus, it is clearly correct to say that m is equal to the valence of Core, as this is the plain meaning of "m-valent."

As a practical matter, in claim 11, both "n" and "m" are equal to the valence of Core and they are both the same. The only reason that different letters were used originally is because "n" appeared in original independent claim 1, which defined n as 2 to 12. In any event, in claim 11, as amended, Core is defined with structural formulae, so that the valence of Core is specified. No other issues were raised with respect to the dependent claims 13 and 14, and applicant submits that these claims likewise should be found allowable for the reasons set forth above.

Favorable reconsideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested based on the foregoing remarks.

CONCLUSION

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Brendan Mee  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 43,391

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 485110v1